

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

August 11, 2004

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chairperson Snodgrass, Commissioners Allen, McCarthy, Parnell, Petitpas

**STAFF PRESENT:** Lori Peckol, Sarah Stiteler, Redmond Planning Department

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Gerry Lindsay

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Snodgrass in the Public Safety Building Council Chambers. Commissioners Dunn and Querry were excused.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

The agenda was approved by consensus.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

A. August 4, 2004

The minutes as written were approved by acclamation.

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE** – None

**PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION**

2003-2004 Comprehensive Plan Update  
– Participation, Implementation and Evaluation Element

Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing opening.

There was no one present to address the Commission.

Chair Snodgrass declared the public hearing closed.

Turning to the study session, Chair Snodgrass referred to the second bullet item under Policy PI-13 and suggested that basing decisions on the Land Use Plan Map instead of the land use policies when there are conflicts seems the wrong way around. Principal Planner Lori Peckol allowed that the Land Use Plan Map has far more detail than the land use designation policies. She added that it seems unlikely that there would even be a conflict arise between the fairly broad designation policies and the land use map. Where conflicts arise between the permitted uses in the Development Guide and the Comprehensive Plan, the Comprehensive Plan controls.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Petitpas, Ms. Peckol said the Land Use Plan Map is updated as needed. The most likely update scenario is changes to designations resulting from a property owner request that require both a Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code change. With regard to Policy PI-19, Chair Snodgrass suggested that there should be a policy in place requiring the regulations to be easily accessible by the public. Ms. Peckol suggested that they are easily accessible by the public; they are all on the web and available at City Hall. Chair Snodgrass said that has resulted at the direction of the current administration but it is not adopted city policy. He proposed adding to Policy PI-19 "...regulations are clearly written, easily accessible to the public...."

Ms. Peckol said another option would be to add the access issue to Policy PI-7 which is focused on access. There was agreement to add the concept to that policy.

Commissioner Parnell floated the notion of including in policy language direction to update the municipal code within a reasonable period of time following any update to the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Peckol said there is broad language in PI-11 that could be revised to include updating the municipal code.

Chair Snodgrass referred to Policy PI-27 and said he did not understand how an action strategy can be adopted by reference as part of the Comprehensive Plan. He suggested that the policy language should be revised to indicate that the action strategy will be adopted as a functional plan. There was agreement to revise the language accordingly.

Commissioner Petitpas referred to Policy PI-25 and asked what the written and objective standards are. Ms. Peckol said they are the standards in the Development Guide and can also be the conditions of approval that are based on Development Guide regulations.

Commissioner McCarthy asked where the no net loss policy called out in the fourth bullet of Policy PI-16 is referenced. Ms. Peckol allowed that it is in the Housing Element. She offered to include a policy number reference; there was agreement to take that approach.

Commissioner Parnell asked how citizens can go about obtaining copies of emails or written correspondence distributed at a particular public meeting. He suggested that in the interest of making such documents available to the public it would be a good idea to have some sort of document archive. Chair Snodgrass noted that the minutes of all City Council and Planning Commission meetings are accessible online. Ms. Peckol said all on-line documents may be searched on a topic basis. The documents are not, however, all available in electronic format, and she said she would be hesitant to commit the city to archiving all documents electronically without first talking with the information systems group. It was agreed to add "where feasible" or "to the extent possible."

Commissioner McCarthy commented that getting to the point where the city could store all documents electronically would require additional infrastructure and cost, something the taxpayers may or may not support. The concept of public availability in all formats is attractive, but the current system is working and the public is able to obtain any document.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Allen regarding Policy PI-23, Ms. Peckol said a two-part test is outlined. The first part focuses on projects that may not be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the fact that there may be community benefit in assisting the applicant for the sake of community involvement and participation. The second part suggests stronger participation for projects that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Senior Planner Sarah Stiteler allowed that any time an applicant steps forward with a request to change the Comprehensive Plan, which is the right of any property owner, the issue at hand is a matter that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Such requests are frequently made, and staff must provide assistance.

Commissioner Allen suggested that as written Policy PI-23 would not permit city staff involvement in the community review process for any proposed Comprehensive Plan change. Ms. Peckol agreed that the language should be revised to clarify what is meant by active participation in the early involvement process.

Turning to the issues list, attention was given to the depiction of the public policy formation process in graphic format. Ms. Peckol distributed to the Commissioners two layout options and proposed holding off making a final recommendation until all of the individual element updates have been completed. Her suggestion was accepted.

Commissioner Parnell raised the notion of establishing a weekly “Monday memo” with a wrap-up of activities completed during the previous week and a rundown of the activities planned for the coming week. Ms. Peckol said every three months the planning department produces a report on all development projects and all long-range planning projects. The report is widely distributed.

There was no support for developing a formal policy calling for regular update reports.

## **STUDY SESSION**

### **2003-2004 Comprehensive Plan Update – Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Arts**

The Commissioners worked through the issues list and focused on the open items. There was general agreement against the notion of prioritizing uses.

With regard to policies PR-18 and PR-21, Commissioner Parnell asked if the mere mention of soccer fields in the Comprehensive Plan requires the use to be included in the functional plans. Chair Snodgrass proposed that calling out specific types of sports fields is not that directive. Ms. Stiteler said the listing of specific sport fields provides the reader with an example of what is meant by terms such as non-competitive and non-organized active recreation. There is no intention in the language of the policy to imply any prioritization of uses; they are included as examples only.

Commissioner Allen shared the concern that by including the specific uses the conclusion could be reached that those uses should be given priority. She said she would support any language tweak that would allay that general concern. Commissioner Petitpas proposed adding the term “such as” to Policy PR-19, noting that the phrase is already used in policies PR-20 and PR-26. Chair Snodgrass encouraged use of the phrase “such as but not limited to” or “including but not limited to” to avoid any questions.

There was agreement to add “such as but not limited to.” There was also agreement to revise Policy PR-26 by moving it up to follow Policies 18, 19 and 20. It then would also be in sequence with those policies and have a similar format.

With regard to pea patches and the like, Chair Snodgrass said he would not want the use called out in any way that would imply a priority, but allowed that the use does not fit neatly into any other category and therefore needs to be singled out in some way.

Commissioner McCarthy suggested adding “public gardens” to the list in Policy PR-26. Chair Snodgrass countered that a public garden is in a different category in that it is a passive use. A pea patch is a far more hands-on and active use. Commissioner McCarthy said one solution would be to expand the definition of “public garden” to include pea patches.

Chair Snodgrass asked Commissioner Parnell to craft a revision to Policy PR-26 to include pea patches without prioritizing the use.

BREAK

Turning to the issue of whether or not there should be a policy on cooperation with the city of Sammamish, Chair Snodgrass noted that Policy PR-15 talks about coordinating with King County and neighboring jurisdictions, which would include Sammamish. Given that, there was agreement to close the issue.

With regard to Policy PR-7, Commissioner Parnell proposed adding the notion of individuals donating artwork in addition to donations of land. It was agreed language to that end should be included as a separate policy.

It was proposed that Policy PR-27 be revised to include “Provide appropriate and well designed signage to encourage wayfinding and connectivity.” There was agreement to add the language to the policy.

Commissioner McCarthy suggested that Policy PR-44 is related to Policy PR-27 but not identical; the issue is one of consistency. In PR-44 there should be some reference to encouraging transit to extend to the trailheads. As written, the policy appears to encourage the use of mass transit everywhere except at trailheads.

Commissioner Parnell said one answer would be to include a policy calling for transit to serve all park locations. Chair Snodgrass pointed out that the city does not have the authority to tell King County Metro where to site bus stops. It can be encouraged but not dictated.

Ms. Stiteler said Policy PR-37 calls for the coordination of planning of trails, bike lanes and other non-motorized modes of transportation with other jurisdictions, which broadly interpreted could mean King County Metro and Sound Transit.

It was agreed that staff should seek out the best policy in which to include a bullet about encouraging connectivity between trails, trailheads and public transit.

Chair Snodgrass suggested that the issue of additional active recreational and cultural facilities for downtown residents is a staff issue. He noted that several policies address the individual issues and it was agreed that no additional references are needed.

Commissioner Parnell said he would prefer to see the recreational and cultural needs of downtown residents called out in a separate policy. Chair Snodgrass said that is the level of detail found primarily in the PRO plan; the Planning Commission is not a park-planning entity and is not staffed by professionals with parks know-how. Commissioner Parnell agreed but pointed out that neither does the Parks Board have a full grasp of the Housing Element; a bridge between the two would be a good thing.

Ms. Stiteler said the policies in Parks, Recreational and Arts Element mention specifically the distribution of parks, recreational and cultural facilities throughout the city in an equitable manner, especially those areas experiencing rapid growth, such as the Downtown and Overlake.

Commissioner Parnell said he would be much happier with Policy PR-4 if the term “equitable service radius” were not included. The radius for the downtown and transit-oriented developments must be different.

Commissioner McCarthy suggested that “equitable service radius” is a term that would be different for different areas of the city depending largely on density and distance. Leaving the phrase out could mean certain areas will not be as well served. Ms. Stiteler allowed that “equitable” is a relative term; the policy specifically calls out instances in which what is meant by the term may require much more in-depth review.

Commissioner Parnell commented that concentrating transportation dollars on the urban areas makes sense; at the same time parks dollars should be concentrated in those areas. If there is a choice between developing a park use at Farrel McWhirter and a parks use at a downtown location, the downtown location should take precedence. Chair Snodgrass suggested that from the standpoint of the Parks Board there are issues to be considered that are larger than land use patterns. There are 10,000 kids in the city that need a place to play baseball, and that may for several reasons be more important than developing a passive recreation site in the downtown.

Ms. Stiteler said staff has given careful consideration to the needs of all areas for recreational and cultural needs. The conclusion reached is that the policies acknowledge additional growth in urban areas and the needs for adequate services and additional gathering places.

Commissioner Parnell said he would accept having the policies specifically state that the urban areas are primary locations for park investments. Commissioner McCarthy disagreed, suggesting that that would be going too far towards directing the Parks Board with regard to where future park facilities should be constructed. The Planning Commission simply does not have that expertise. Chair Snodgrass agreed, suggesting that to be too specific is to attempt micromanagement. If the Planning Commission wants to take that approach, it might as well go ahead and write the PRO plan as well.

The matter was closed.

With regard to expanding, maintaining and developing the space on the municipal campus, Chair Snodgrass suggested that it would do no harm to have the same policy in both the downtown plan and the parks element for consistency. Ms. Stiteler said staff is comfortable with having the policy in just the downtown plan. There was no support for including the policy in both places.

The Commission reviewed the issue of including language aimed at reflecting a prejudice toward the acquisition by the city of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe railroad right-of-way for park use. It was noted that in the opinion of staff the issue should remain open until the plans are more fully developed; to be too specific early on may inadvertently tie the city's hands. It was agreed that the policy language should not be revised.

Proposed new language referencing Farrel McWhirter Park in the Special Feature section was reviewed and approved.

With regard to including a more specific reference and clear mandate about the scope of the PRO plan, Ms. Peckol said the Capital Facilities Element will address many of the concerns in that it addresses the minimal requirements for a functional plan. It was agreed that the Commission should steer clear of being too specific given that there is a body charged with developing the PRO plan and determining what should be in it.

Chair Snodgrass called attention to Policy PR-6 and asked what consequences might result if the word "require" were substituted for "encourage." Ms. Stiteler said the city requires a percentage of open space for all new residential development, and encourages the construction of multi-use pathways through new development to provide needed linkages between trail routes and access to public destinations. The open space policies encourage the public use of private open space, including existing informal trail systems.

Chair Snodgrass allowed that Policy PR-6 is an existing policy and that it has worked relatively well. He said he was not ready to take the next step and require land set-asides for anything beyond trails. It was agreed that the issue should be closed.

Ms. Stiteler said staff will produce an updated draft of the element showing the revisions made and get it out to the Commissioners as soon as possible.

## **REPORTS**

Commissioner Allen reported that she recently visited Conover Commons, the cottage project on 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue. She said the development is a wonderful place and nine of the twelve cottages have been sold.

Ms. Peckol reported that staff has completed the Capital Facilities Element and distributed it to the Commission. It is scheduled for Commission review and public hearing on August 18.

## **SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)**

Ms. Peckol said final review of the Transportation Element is slated for the meeting on August 18. She asked that any final edits to be brought to the attention of staff as soon as possible.

The City Council is scheduled to adopt the first six elements of the Comprehensive Plan at its business meeting on August 17. The Council is contemplating some revisions to certain policies.

The Council reviewed the Regional Planning and Annexation Element on August 10 and by and large concurred with the recommendation of the Commission.

## **ADJOURN**

Chair Snodgrass adjourned the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Recording Secretary: